

**OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY
AND HEALTH STANDARDS BOARD**

2520 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 350
Sacramento, CA 95833
(916) 274-5721
FAX (916) 274-5743

**FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS****CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS**

TITLE 8: Chapter 4, Subchapter 7, Article 7, Section 3340 (c) and (d)
of the General Industry Safety Orders

Accident Prevention Signs

There are no modifications to the information contained in the Initial Statement of Reasons.

SUMMARY AND RESPONSE TO ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMENTS

There were no written comments received.

I. Oral Comments

Oral comments received at the September 20, 2001, Public Hearing in Los Angeles, California.

Mr. Jere Ingram, Chairman, Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board (Board),
Mr. Michael J. Manieri Jr., Principal Engineer, Board staff.

Dialog:

Chairman Ingram requested clarification with regard to warning signs and how employers are affected. Mr. Manieri cited several examples of situations where the use of warning signs would be applied, such as decreased headroom clearance, hot working surfaces, energized equipment, etc. Chairman Ingram asked Mr. Manieri if the use of warning signs would be equal to training all affected employees with regard to a specific hazard. Mr. Manieri responded that the posting of warning signs is typically an augmentation to employee training/instruction.

Further Response:

According to the ANSI Z 535.2-1998 standard for Environmental and Facility Safety signs, warning signs are defined as a sign used to indicate a potentially hazardous situation which, if not avoided, could result in death or serious injury. The Board notes that staff provided examples of workplace situations that might require the use of

warning signs, which also include situations where moving parts could cut or crush an employee.

The Board recognizes that warning signs, caution signs, danger signs, etc., are only one part of an effective employee injury illness and injury prevention program as required by Section 3203 of the General Industry Safety Orders (GISO). Additionally, the Board recognizes that under Section 3203, employees must receive training/instruction in those hazards unique to their job functions and that sign posting alone is insufficient.

Ms. Kim Mueller, Board member, Mr. Michael J. Manieri Jr., Principal Engineer, Board staff.

Dialog:

Ms. Mueller asked Mr. Manieri to describe the approval process stipulated by Section 3206 of the GISO. Mr. Manieri responded by providing Ms. Mueller with a generalized description of the regulatory text in Section 3206 which addresses National Consensus Standards (e.g., American National Standards Institute or ANSI), National Testing and Research Laboratories (NTRLs), the submission of evidence or documentation demonstrating the application of sound scientific principles, etc.

Further Response:

As stated by Board staff in the response to Board member Mueller's question, Section 3206 is contained within the GISO and states that when the term "approved" is used in the GISO, it shall refer to products, materials, devices, systems or installations that have been approved, listed, labeled or certified as conforming to applicable governmental or other nationally recognized standards (e.g., ANSI 535.2-1998). The Board recognizes that the ANSI 535.2 standard provides specifications for the design and appearance of warning signs and that a warning sign that meets the specifications stipulated in the ANSI 535.2 standard, upon which Board staff's proposed warning sign language is based, would be "approved" in accordance with Section 3206 of the GISO.

The Board is also aware that Section 3206 provides other means by which materials, devices, etc., may be approved, which include NTRL certification or documentation from the employer that the device or material is safe for its intended use, which must be provided to the Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Division) upon request.

It is also recognized that if approval is not achievable by any of the methods described earlier, the employer must submit to the Division for approval, engineering calculations, drawings, stress analyses, or other pertinent scientific data to demonstrate that the equipment or material is safe for its intended use.

DETERMINATION OF MANDATE

This regulation does not impose a mandate on local agencies or school districts as indicated in the Initial Statement of Reasons.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The Board invited interested persons to present statements or arguments with respect to alternatives to the proposed regulation. No alternative considered by the Board would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the adopted action.